DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 381 507 SP 035 879

AUTHOR	Geltner, Beverley B.
TITLE	Shaping New Leaders for New Schools: Using the Case Method for Innovative Teaching and Learning.
PUB DATE	Mar 95
NOTE	15p.; Paper presented at the International Conference on Case Method Research and Application (12th, Leysin, Switzerland, June 18-21, 1995).
PUB TYPE	Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Case Studies; College Instruction; *Doctoral Programs; *Educational Administration; Educational Innovation; Faculty Development; Graduate Study; Higher Education; Interdisciplinary Approach; *Leadership Training; *Student Evaluation; Teaching Methods; Theory Practice Relationship; Undergraduate Study
IDENTIFIERS	*Case Method (Teaching Technique); Comprehensive Examinations; *Eastern Michigan University

ABSTRACT

The educational administration faculty at Eastern Michigan University sought to expand the linkage between theory and practice in all aspects of the program and to bridge traditional course divisions. A department-wide case method initiative was introduced with the purpose of developing the case-method teaching skills of all department members and infusing case teaching in the design of all courses and in classroom instruction and assessment at all levels. The University's Faculty Center for Instructional Excellence presented workshops on case instruction, provided sample materials, and conducted individual faculty coaching sessions on the writing and teaching of cases. For the doctoral comprehensive examination, an interdisciplinary case study was developed, to assess the knowledge base and skill levels attained by students by confronting them with a complex, reality-based problem. Writing the doctoral case examinations served as a powerful opportunity for all faculty to collaborate on a significant teaching and grading innovation. Applying the case method to the doctoral comprehensive examination has had enormous impact on all aspects of the program including faculty knowledge, teaching repertoire, and attitude; student interest, motivation, and understanding; assessment of student learning; and course and program design at the doctoral, specialist, and master's level. (Contains 25 references.) (JDD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 381 507

SHAPING NEW LEADERS FOR NEW SCHOOLS: USING THE CASE METHOD FOR INNOVATIVE TEACHING AND LEARNING

Beverley B. Geltner, Associate Professor
Eastern Michigan University
YPSILANTI, MICHIGAN

A paper presented at the
Twelfth International Conference on
Case Method Research and Application
June 18-21, 1995
Leysin, Switzerland

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

B. Geltner

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Abstract

This paper describes the experiences of an educational administration faculty who changed the design and instructional methodology of a program for the preparation of professional school administrators. It presents the rationale for the selection of the case method as a pedagogical instrument for professional development. Change was initiated within a framework that focused on adult learning theory, linkage of theory and practice, reality-based pedagogical design, faculty work culture and the complexities of the change process. The impact of the change on program design, faculty attitude toward teaching, development of teaching skills, student motivation and effectiveness of learning is presented.

INTRODUCTION

In the last decade, efforts to transform the preparation of leaders have assumed international attention. The impact of accelerated global interdependency and competition has stimulated inquiry and innovation regarding professional preparation for both the private and public sectors. Perhaps no field has received greater attention than that of public education. Virtually all nations--those long industrialized, those undergoing rapid technological transformation, those emerging from the yoke of totalitarian, centralized control--all face the challenge of preparing their citizenry for survival and success in a complex, knowledge-based post-industrial society. Further, all share awareness of the primacy of developing the knowledge and skills of their present and future workers to achieve national well being. Thus, the central importance of public education and the quality of its leaders.

Those charged with the responsibility of developing such leaders--professors of educational administration--have in recent years been involved in intensive dialogue with colleagues at an international level. Their focus has been the examination of the deficiencies and inadequacies of traditional professional preparation programs to meet the challenges contained within the new definitions of effective leadership. Critical dimensions of this new leadership model include the ability to envision and build systemic learning organizations (Senge, 1992); to practice leadership from a multiple frames perspective (Bolman and Deal (1994); to understand the chaos and complexities of change (Wheatley, 1993 and Fullan, 1993); and to engage in reflective practice (Schon, 1990; Langer and Colton, 1994). Recent publications by organizations such as the National Policy Board for Educational Administration (1989) and the Danforth Foundation (Milstein, 1993) and by members of the professoriate (Murphy, 1992, Achilles, 1989) have called all aspects of professional leadership preparation into question: program purpose and focus; instructional design and implementation; teaching methodologies; reflection on practice; and assessment.

It was this challenge that motivated the educational administration faculty at Eastern Michigan University to reflect upon the nature and design of their current professional preparation program for school leaders. A key issue that emerged was the need to expand the linkage between theory and practice in all courses and all aspects of the entire program. Just as the world of practice presents problems of overlapping issues and complexity, so must the world of preparation approximate that reality. Traditional course divisions had to be bridged; the safety and isolation of the university classroom had to be transcended. Simulations, case studies and other approximations of reality provided promise of integrating all learnings across disciplinary lines and providing synthesizing experiences which could combine all aspects of effective educational leadership: technical, ethical, managerial and transformative. Accordingly, the department-wide case method initiative was introduced with the purpose of developing the case-method teaching skills of all members of the department, and infusing case teaching in the design of all courses, and in classroom instruction and assessment at all levels--from beginning Master's level graduate students to senior doctoral fellows.

CASE STUDIES AND PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION

Case studies have long been used in various professional preparation programs, particularly law, business and medicine, [Christensen, 1987]. Their virtue is that they serve as a vehicle by which a particular situation or dilemma may be presented, complete with richly described events and characters. According to Lawrence, [1953]:

> A good case is the vehicle by which a chunk of reality is brought into the classroom to be worked over by the class and the instructor. A good case keeps the discussion grounded upon some of the stubborn facts that must be faced in real

> life situations. It is the anchor on academic flights of speculation. It is the record of complex situations that must be literally pulled apart and put together again before the situations can be understood (p. 107).

For administrator preparation programs, cases offer an opportunity to examine and reflect upon a particular problem--its content, context, students, pedagogy, other characters, prior experiences, personal views and values, scripts--and to access and apply the professional knowledge base to interpret data and make decisions (Culbertson and Coffield, 1960, Griffith, 1963). The possible range of topics is virtually limitless--school mission, climate, organizational restructuring, educational reform efforts, evaluation and assessment, coordination of services with community agencies... Whatever the topic, a well written case presents students with a life-like problem in which they must link theory and practice in exercising their educational leadership responsibilities. Specifically, it calls upon students to study a situation carefully by observing, gathering information, analyzing and interpreting data, hypothesizing, and choosing a course of action (Langer and Colton, 1994).

Furthermore, in imitation of life, effective cases do not present themselves in neatly compartmentalized divisions, with clearly identifiable self-contained issues. Rather, they are distinguished by their ambiguity and their openness to multiple interpretations and resolutions. The solutions sought depend on the problem-framing process employed; the critical issue is often not the quest for the right answer, but the identification of the key question [Dezure, 1993].

The case method permits students to develop interdisciplinary leadership skills by presenting them with complex situations which need to be analyzed, diagnosed, reflected upon and solved. Administrative behavior is a mixture of political, social, psychological and cognitive influences, personal values and beliefs. Through cases, students can consider holistically multiple fields of knowledge, in conjunction with their own personal educational philosophy. Thus, current research in psychology, pedagogy, sociology, organizational theory and leadership can be considered with awareness of one's own personal and professional values and beliefs. In addition, new technologies such as computer-based information processing and electronic communication can be invoked as problem-solving instruments.

Cases can call upon students to examine and reframe problems from multiple perspectives --political, human resource, structural and cultural or symbolic [Bolman and Deal, 1994]. By placing themselves in the shoes of professional practitioners and deciding how they would conceptualize and approach complex situations, they can engage in a dynamic and individually empowering problem-solving model, one that can provoke them to apply the heuristic to their own problems.

As a pedagogical device, the case method creates a need to know. It has the potential to provoke a sense of intellectual disquiet and stimulate students to find out for themselves what they come to realize they do not know. Case-based pedagogy is based on the understanding that the most important learning, the most meaningful learning, the most long-lasting learning comes from the work the learner does on his or her own--active learning [Hutchings, 1992].

Related to this aspect of professional development is the potential of the case method to develop in students the process of professional reflection. Skilled practitioners in all professions are able to use experiences productively. [Schon, 1990]. They do so by constantly relating their day-to-day encounters to a theoretical base. This process of reflection permits the practitioner to gain a fuller understanding of processes, challenges, and problems that are never fully rational or predictable. It calls upon students to consider alternative choices and decisions, along with the potential merits and liabilities of those alternatives, given the situational variables provided. It allows students to construct a "theory of practice" for educational leadership by encouraging them to reflect on the individual actions of other school leaders in situations of life-like complexity.

Thus, the case method can further professional development by creating in students a need to synthesize, organize, and classify facts that emerge from observations and collections of data; interface with the data; use their analytic and critical thinking skills; apply their knowledge of

educational theory and research; draw upon their personal experiences; connect with their own belief and value systems; consider various alternatives; create and imagine multiple courses of action; and reflect on the possible outcomes. In this way, the case method can serve as a learning laboratory, in which students are free to "try out" various professional behaviors in a low-risk environment.

Finally, the case method can serve as a pedagogical approach that can help students prepare for effective leadership as change agents. By providing the "text", students can consider both individually and through synergistic interaction with colleagues how certain administrative problem-solving approaches, decisions and choices led to certain responses and affected the progress and productivity of the organization. They can examine the multiple dimensions of leadership behavior involved in the transformation of organizations from traditional, static organisms into dynamic learning systems [Senge, 1990, Fullan, 1993, Wheatley, 1992].

INTRODUCING THE CHANGE

Aware of the need to introduce major changes in the educational leadership preparation program, members of the faculty at Eastern Michigan University began a comprehensive process of transformation. Their initial focus was on themselves--on the need for all faculty involved to:

a. become more aware of national and international professional preparation reform efforts
b. become more informed about the multiple dimensions of case-method teaching for professional preparation
c. develop the capacity to become effective case writers
d. develop the capacity to become effective case-method teachers

This need for faculty development was addressed through support offered by the University's *Faculty Center for Instructional Excellence.* In conjunction with the *Case Studies Project of the American Association for Higher Education (AAHE)*, the Center presented a series of workshops on case instruction, provided rich new external resources and sample materials [Hutchings, 1993], and followed up with individual faculty coaching sessions on the writing and teaching of cases.

New understandings came to be shared by all involved faculty, including the criteria and guidelines of exemplary cases as suggested by AAHE. These criteria served to guide the new cases that were written by faculty in virtually all the sub-disciplines of educational administration, specifically: educational law, educational finance, organizational theory, program evaluation, leadership theory, supervision, and school-community relations. Faculty critiqued each others' written drafts of teaching cases, examining them according to the following criteria:

- Cases should be windows on the wisdom of practice
- Good cases have richness and complexity
- Good cases have political credibility
- Good cases are particular and contextualized, with richly detailed surrounding material
- Good cases have intellectual and emotional dimensions
- Good cases derive directly from actual field-based situations, or approximate real problems and dilemmas by their complexity and ambiguity
- Good cases serve to stimulate multi-frame analysis, multi-question posing, and multi-solution design
- Good cases are not too long...but long enough to capture the complexity and the important, deeper issues of teaching and learning

FROM CASE WRITING TO COLLABORATION

Half-way through the first year of the case-method initiative, it became apparent that not only were the approach and design to professional training changing, but more significantly, faculty themselves were undergoing a process of transformation. The very process of designing cases based on actual practice brought faculty face-to-face with the realities of interdisciplinary connections, complexities and ambiguities that operate in authentic settings. Sharing cases with colleagues led to new knowledge and understanding of the fields of study of individual faculty, their unique orientations, experiences and approaches to teaching and learning. Where formerly there had been social cordiality but professional separation, new collaborative patterns gradually emerged.

Shulman [1993] addressed what he refers to as the "pedagogical solitude" of professorial life, the isolation that faculty experience when they close the classroom door. He urged that teaching, along with scholarship, be made community property, through a series of actions that made it visible and valued. Through *pedagogical colloquia*, he suggested that faculty could acquire new knowledge and understanding of their colleagues' approaches to teaching, to course design, to the pedagogy of their specific area. Departmental community for Shulman would thus be enriched by the inclusion of professional conversation about teaching and learning.

Barth [1991] also wrote about the importance of collaboration among faculty for the development of a true learning community. He described the crisis found in many educational settings--faculty separated from one another, compartmentalized like children engaged in "parallel play", leading separate lives in professional isolation. In contrast, he described collegial environments, in which faculty engage in four specific behaviors:

1. Talk about practice--frequent, continuous and precise.
2. Observation of each other engaged in the practice of teaching.
3. Shared engagement in work on curriculum--planning, designing, researching and evaluating.
4. Teaching each other what they know about teaching, learning and learning; revelation, articulation and sharing of craft knowledge (p. 31).

It was only by building a "community of learners" and a "community of leaders", Barth stated, that true educational reform could be achieved.

FROM COLLABORATION TO THE INTERDISCIPLINARY CASE DOCTORAL COMPREHENSIVE EXAMINATION

In the emerging new departmental community, enlivened by ongoing discussion, collaboration and learning, faculty addressed a critical issue relating to the preparation and assessment of professional school leaders, namely, the program's doctoral comprehensive examination. To this point, the model in use was one adopted from older doctoral programs. It consisted of several discrete questions related to specific issues or fields of study within the general area of educational administration. Both faculty and students were dissatisfied with the model, based on their own experience, and on the recommendations of the National Policy Board (1989) and other reform bodies. What was needed, it was argued, was a capstone experience that would require candidates to demonstrate the ability to think holistically, to understand the integration and interrelationships of all aspects of their field, to demonstrate their capacity to link theory and practice, to analyze complex problems, to think critically, to solve problems and to make decisions. The alternate model selected was one that grew out of the faculty's developing expertise in the case method--an interdisciplinary case study which would serve to assess the knowledge base and skill levels attained by students by confronting them with a complex, reality-based problem.

The process of developing the departmental doctoral case study caused faculty to move to a deeper level of professional collaboration. In order to develop the case, faculty had to make clear to each other the comprehensive knowledge base on which the case study was to be built; they

had to inform and assure all faculty involved that critical content from all areas of the program was included in an integrated, holistic way. As summarized by one member of the faculty,

> Our tentative exploratory initial discussions led to our realization that we had to agree on the subject matter of the case--the particular problem or dilemma to be presented. Soon, we realized that other steps had to precede this decision; specifically, we had to become clear and explicit with each other about the essential knowledge and skills we wished students to demonstrate, in all subject areas/domains of the entire knowledge base. This required that each individual faculty make explicit to colleagues the content/critical learnings/and knowledge base of the particular subject area for which s/he had responsibility. It was a first attempt to crystallize what had formerly been inchoate.

To date, three comprehensive doctoral case studies have been developed and used. The first was focused on the problems faced by a school superintendent (director of education) who had to address the issue of reorganizing the district's school attendance areas because of inequities in size, resources, student demographic distribution, overcrowding and achievement variations. Complicating the task were multiple political, sociological, financial and cultural factors, all of which demanded consideration.

The second comprehensive doctoral case study centered on a breakdown in faculty-board relations and a culminating teacher strike. Once again, reality-based complexities were introduced into the case. The history of the community and the school was described, along with a portrayal of the divisions among members of the board, among faculty and among administrators. The frustration of community members and elected government officials was presented, introducing the component of external pressure accelerating and spinning out of control. In short, the key figure in the case--the superintendent (educational director) was facing a total organizational breakdown. "How," the case title asked, "could the pieces be put back together again?"

The third case examination presented the challenges involved in introducing major change into an educational system through the use of new technologies. The task was to integrate new information technologies--computers, interactive videodiscs, electronic communication, etc.--into all aspects of the organization--instructional, managerial and administrative. Issues of readiness for change, psychological resistance, organizational restructuring, training and development, union challenges, costs--all were woven into the narrative to present a situation of complexity, ambiguity and challenge.

THE CASE WRITING PROCESS

Writing each of the above comprehensive doctoral case examinations served as a powerful opportunity for all faculty to collaborate on a significant teaching and grading innovation. As faculty convened to prepare the first case, they had to confront several questions:

1. What would be theme or focus of the case? What was required was a problem or dilemma that could contain multiple issues, overlapping conflicts, ambiguities, differing belief systems and no clear solutions.
2. How could each discipline/strand of the program be woven into the case?

Here the requirement was inclusion of all components of the entire program of study, to permit the assessment of student understanding and skills related to discrete knowledge bases, and to their interrelationships.

3. How could the narrative be drafted so as to be sufficiently complex but not overly detailed? Faculty had to operate within the constraints of a six-hour examination period, during which time students were to construct their responses.
4. What instructions should be given to students? What role were they to take? What information and knowledge did faculty wish to elicit?

5. How would student responses be graded? What would constitute an exemplary response, a satisfactory response, an inadequate response? Since there was, by definition, no one right answer, on what bases would assessment be made?

Clarification of these questions served to guide faculty through the process of case writing. Gradually, a process unfolded, consisting of a series of sequential decisions, each building on the one before. First, faculty had to explicate to each other the critical learnings in their particular field, e.g., key concepts to be addressed in organizational theory, in educational law, etc. The result of this was an ongoing professional conversation which led to new understandings of the interconnections among the discrete disciplines within the entire field.

Then, the search began for an appropriate core problem/dilemma. The challenge was to design a comprehensive examination in which all aspects of the preparation program were integrated into a holistic scenario--that is, to replicate in narrative form a realistic educational environment similar to that which a graduate might encounter upon graduation. Faculty sought a situation or combination of situations that presented the greatest opportunity to assess student knowledge and expertise, analytic and reflective thinking, problem-solving skills, application of theory to problems of practice, and capacity for leadership in the given scenario. Several alternatives were considered, all reviewed in response to the questions raised above and in accordance with the guidelines of exemplary cases described earlier. Following initial brainstorming sessions to determine elements of content, individual faculty members assumed responsibility to develop a section of the case. Subsequent working sessions were held to review and critique the work, reiterate as needed, share tasks, and develop/acquire accompanying supplementary materials. After multiple departmental writing and review sessions, a preliminary draft of the entire case was ready. Once again this was critiqued, rewritten, recritiqued, and rewritten... until it was complete, approved and ready to go.

IMPACT OF THE DOCTORAL COMPREHENSIVE QUALIFYING CASE STUDY EXAMINATION

Applying the case method to the doctoral comprehensive examination has had enormous impact on all aspects of the program including faculty knowledge, teaching repertoire and attitude; student interest, motivation and understanding; and assessment of student learning; and course and program design at the doctoral, specialist and master's level. Extensive individual and group interviews with all faculty involved and with students who participated in the doctoral comprehensive qualifying case study examination have revealed several major themes relating to the transformation of teaching, learning and assessment.

Impact on Faculty

Reexamination of the doctoral comprehensive qualifying exam served as a catalyst for consideration by all faculty of deeper issues relating to the entire program. Fundamental questions were revisited: what was the purpose of the program; how could research inform our work; how could new linkages be built across subject matter to achieve essential total program integration; how could theory and practice be more closely linked; how could teaching be made more powerful, more evocative and more engaging; how could students be more effectively prepared to be capable practicing professional educational leaders?

Focus on the doctoral examination as a kind of ultimate outcomes assessment stimulated new levels of faculty conversation, learning, professional development and reflection on teaching and learning. New teaching behaviors were modeled, attempted and shared. Professors opened doors to each other, demonstrating their ways of handling case discussion and questioning about making connections and making meaning.

The process of professional sharing around issues of course content, design and pedagogy deepened faculty knowledge and understanding of all courses in the program. Each faculty member was given an opportunity to explicate the content, importance, relevance of his/her subject area as it connected to the whole schema of doctoral-level administrator preparation.

No longer was the content just a few lines in a graduate catalog or a program description; rather, it was an integral component inextricably linked to the entire knowledge base of a comprehensive program of professional preparation. Since all courses were now to be connected holistically in one summative assessment experience, and since the modality of the assessment device had to be infused into all levels and courses of the program in order to adequately prepare students, faculty had to operate at deeper levels of professional collegiality. Individual fields of discipline and specialization had to be woven into a coherent, holistic program built on shared values and ideals. The outcome was not just a new examination, but a new departmental sense of community, articulating a unifying sense of shared purpose, focused on the challenge of effective preparation of professional educational leaders.

Fullan (1992) described the unpredictable and potentially far-reaching impact of the introduction of change, "What appears simple is not so--introducing a seemingly small change turns out to have wild consequences" (p. viii). So it was in this instance: the introduction of the case method into an administrator preparation program proved to be not merely a single innovation, but rather proved the unleashing of a change process which impacted virtually all aspects of teaching and learning in the department.

Fullan also delineated some of the stressful aspects of the change process, the requirements that one "suspend belief, take risks, and experience the unknown" (p. 17). Describing the anxiety, conflict and stress that accompany the change process, he defined as one of the core capacities required for effective change agentry that of collaboration.

> There is a ceiling effect to how much we can learn if we keep to ourselves. The ability to collaborate. . . is becoming one of the core requisites of postmodern society...People need one another to learn and to accomplish things (p. 17).

The process of departmental case preparation and assessment provided an opportunity for all members of the department to gain ownership in the doctoral program, and to develop both individual and departmental power. For one member, the collaborative process of conversation, case writing, critiquing and rewriting served as:

> . . .a first opportunity to involve everyone in the doctoral program. It was a unifying factor which enabled us to work together to improve the product, forming a sort of synergistic meshing of the personal into departmental power.

For another, the process was "creative, collaborative, supportive, respectful and motivating". A senior member of the department stated,

> It was a first attempt to crystallize what had been inchoate rumblings and to learn of colleagues' personal platforms and how they related to departmental focus.

Further, the process of collaborating on the writing of the departmental case study served as a vehicle by which new faculty connections were forged. One member, in her second year in the department, expressed her views as follows:

> The setting of working on the case study provided us a forum for identifying commonalities that connect us and the threads that run through us. In evidence were human relations skills that allowed us to blend our styles and build on our strengths and limitations...

For a new member of the department, the process of collaborating on the development of the case examination served as an opportunity for acculturation and professional development:

> Probably for me, on a personal level, I saw how we needed to develop case studies, how the process worked, and how we got involved as a group. I also saw that if we were going to use these as doctoral examinations, we needed to be using them in classes, so, it emphasized for me, the need to use case studies in our teaching.

The process of collaborative case development served further to expand awareness of the interests and expertise of individual faculty while increasing the willingness to share resources, ideas and experiences. A major theme which emerged among faculty members was their new knowledge and appreciation of the expertise of their colleagues. One expressed the new respect she gained for a colleague with whom she had worked for two years:

> I knew Bill was really steeped in the economics and collective negotiations piece, but I never really talked about that with him, or really considered how it fit into my piece on school-community relations.
>
> Now I have a deeper sense of the connections, of the impact of a community breakdown. When we were meeting and someone asked, "Have any of you lived through a teachers' strike?," all of us who had, from an administrative perspective, could connect our shared experience. Through having shared common experiences, but with different expertise now brought to them, lights went on...

Finally, one member of the department spoke to the impact of the case exam writing process as it impacted overall program integration and authenticity:

> The process of writing the case study was highly significant. First we discussed the possibility of this approach, and agreed to proceed. There was an openness and willingness to experiment, to innovate. The process of writing was dynamic, exciting and bonding for all participants. We learned something of how we thought, because private understandings and knowledge were made explicit.
>
> The process was also cumulative: we built on what each person said, enriching, adding. We had collaborated to solve a real problem, and had based our actions on our professional knowledge, our experience, and all our prior lives' work as practicing administrators and professors. The complexity that we knew in our former lives as practitioners was now brought more directly into our work with our students--presenting them with more complex issues to be identified, analyzed and problem solved.

Impact on Students

Diffusion of the case method throughout all courses in the program not only served to transform teaching, but also enhanced student interest, motivation, and understanding. For students, powerful new linkages were between what was read and discussed in class, and what was applied and understood "in the field".

One student reflected on the impact of a case study having to do with the behavior of an individual teacher during a professional teacher development inservice:

> When I first read the case having to do with Margaret's behavior during the staff development program--she was correcting student papers instead of listening to the speaker--I decided that Margaret was very rude and unprofessional. The district had paid money to bring in this "outside expert" and Margaret should have paid attention. But then when we discussed it in class, and

we considered critical issues relating to adult learning theory, to shared decision making, to involvement and professionalization of teachers, then I realized the whole situation was all wrong. Deming had it right, "When we look at an employee's behavior and performance on the job," he said, "we should know that the system is 85% responsible, and the employee is 15% responsible."

I came to see it was the system--the district that "blew it". There was no planning, no involvement of staff, no consideration of the context of the event. Everything we learned about effective organizational change was violated, and I never really "got it" until I saw it in the case!

One graduate described how the power of case learning had remained with her almost viscerally after she left the classroom and moved into a position as a professional school administrator.

When I was confronted with the situation involving the conflict between one of my teachers and an angry parent, it was just as if I were back in the case... I could remember the feeling of anxiety and distress I first felt. I remembered what I thought, how I analyzed my options...how we dissected the whole thing...what we might have done, how different actions could lead to different results...It helped me focus on what was going on, analyze how this situation was the same, how it was different...and figure out what to do.

Cases permitted students to integrate their learnings from various courses, building upon the knowledge acquired in specific courses--organizational theory, finance, personnel, supervision, leadership theory--into a holistic, multi-disciplinary application. Thus, a case involving a new principal, a senior school secretary and her reserved parking space came to be understood as **not** merely a matter of a parking space, but rather as an event laden with significant dimensions of organizational culture, and symbolism; power; human relations skills and short-and long-term strategic thinking. As one student wrote in her reflective journal :

I would have just gone blindly on my way, reading behavior at a surface level only. The parking lot case has made me always ask, "What is **really** going on here? What is at stake? What more is there to 'decode', to 'read', than what we first see? I came to see that the new principal's entire future in that school lay on the line depending on how he handled the secretary. He could have 'won the battle but lost the war', without ever realizing what was really involved.

Now, whenever I find myself in a new situation, especially a difficult one, I say to myself, "Remember the parking lot! What's **really** going on here? What's the meaning of all this?"

Finally, student evaluations of case method instruction at the end of their courses over a two-year period revealed their enthusiasm and excitement about this approach to teaching and learning. For them, in-class discussion provided multiple frameworks for analysis and problem solving. The complexities of change process theory [Fullan, 1992], the significance of chaos theory and leadership [Wheatley, 1992], the power of reflection-on-action [Schon, 1990]--all achieved new meaning and clarity when students had to confront and struggle with reality-based portrayals of ambiguity, complexity and conflict in school settings. Most significantly, they stated that by being forced to integrate and apply all their knowledge in the analysis and problem-solving of cases, they felt that they were able to present a more accurate

and comprehensive demonstration of their understanding of the challenges of intelligent, thoughtful educational leadership.

CONCLUSION

The process set in motion in by the introduction of the case method is continuing to evolve. As never before, program and course design, teaching methods and assessment models are under continuous review with new emphasis on total program integration, and ongoing total faculty collaboration. Plans have been made for ongoing total faculty development in case writing, teaching and assessment. Some members of the faculty attended the 1994 *AAHE National Institute on Case Writing and Reflective Practice* in Vancouver, British Columbia; others will be participating this summer. New materials have been obtained and new resource persons identified for additional faculty development. A collection of case studies is being developed and catalogued for use in instruction and assessment in virtually all courses. In addition, these materials are being shared with colleague members of the educational administration professoriate with those in other fields of professional preparation.

The goal is to deepen faculty understanding, knowledge and skills with all aspects of case study teaching: preparation, instruction and assessment. No doubt, this approach to professional preparation will continue to evolve. Initial efforts are underway to integrate video and computer technologies into the case method, providing more effective ways of presenting data, offering alternate scenarios and exploration of decision alternatives. What serves as the focus of all efforts is the challenge faced by all professors of educational administration--to prepare effective future leaders to meet the challenges and needs of tomorrow's schools.

Achilles, C. M., "Searching for the Golden Fleece: The Quest Continues." Paper delivered at Annual Meeting of UCEA. Scottsdale, AZ. ED., (1994).

Barth, R., Improving Schools from Within (Jossey-Bass, 1991).

Bolman, L. G. and T. E. Deal, "Looking for Leadership: Another Search Party's Report," Educational Administration Quarterly, (1994), 30(1), 77-96.

Christensen, C., Teaching and the Case Method (Harvard Business School,1987).

Clark, V., "The Effectiveness of Case Studies in Training Principals. Using the Deliberative Orientation. Peabody Journal of Education, (1986).63, pp. 187-195.

Cossom, J., "Teaching from Cases: Education for Critical Thinking," Journal of Teaching in Social Work, (1991).5(1).

Culbertson, J., and W. Coffield, (Eds.), Simulation in Administration tTaining (University Council for Educational Administration,1960).

Dezure, D, "Using Cases about Teaching in the Disciplines," Change,(1993).25(6),pp. 40-43.

Erskine, J., M. Leenders, M. and L. Mauffette-Leenders, Teaching with Cases (School of Business Administration, University of Western Ontario, 1981).

Fullan, M. G., The New Meaning of Educational Change (Teachers College Press, 1992)

Griffith, D., "The Case Method of Teaching Educational Administration: A re-appraisal." Journal of Educational Administration (1963), 1(2).

Hutchings, P., Using Cases to Improve College Teaching: A Guide to More Reflective Practice (American Association for Higher Education, 1993).

Immegart, G., "The Use of Cases," in D. Bolton, (Ed.), The Use of Simulation in Educational Administration (Charles E. Merrill. 1971), pp.30-64.

Langer, G. M. and A. M. Colton, "Reflective Decision Making: The Cornerstone of School Reform," Journal of Staff Development (Winter 1994), 15(1).

Merriam, S., Case research in education (Jossey-Bass, 1988).

Milstein, M. M. and Assoc., Changing the Way we Prepare Educational Leaders: The Danforth Experience (Corwin.1993).

Murphy, J., The Landscape of Leadership Preparation (Corwin, 1992).

National Policy Board for Educational Administration, Improving the Preparation of School Administrators: An Agenda for Reform The University of Virginia.(1989).

Romm, T., and S. Mahler, "A Three Dimensional Model for Using Case Studies in the Academic Classroom," Higher Education (1986),15, pp. 677-696.

Schon, D., Educating the Reflective Practitioner (Jossey-Bass, 1990).

Shulman, L. S., "Teaching as Community Property: Putting an End to Pedagogical Solitude," Change (November/December 1993), pp.6-13.

Senge, P., The Fifth Discipline: The Art and Practice of the Learning Organization (Doubleday, 1990).

Sergiovanni, T., "Organizations or Communities? Changing the Metaphor Changes the Theory." Paper delivered at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (April 1993).

Sykes, G., and T. Bird, "Teacher Education and the Case Idea.," Review of Research in Education (1992), pp. 457-461.

Wheatley, M., Leadership and the New Science (Berrett-Koehler, 1992).